REMARKS

Formal Matters

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the attention accorded to the instant application, including multiple discussions with applicant's attorney regarding wording of the claims.

Claims 1-9 and 11 are the claims currently pending in the Application. Claims 1 and 8 are amended to more clearly recite the invention. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the specification and in Figures 2 and 4.

Summary of Telephone Interviews

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephone interviews of July 16, 2007, July 30, 2007, August 1, 2007 and August 3, 2007. Applicant believes that the amendments to the claims submitted herewith are in accordance with those discussed in the telephone interviews.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner also rejects claims 1-7, and claims 8, 9, and 11 as incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. These rejections should be withdrawn based on the comments and remarks herein.

Claims 1 and 8 are amended to more clearly recite the invention and to particularly point out and distinctly claim the inventive subject matter. Specifically, claim 1 is amended to recite a web server configured to authenticate the user and

communicate group information to the browser of the user, means for providing the eCommerce service to the browser that communicates the group information to a Lookup Server, and the Lookup Server acting as a registry and providing dynamic updates to the browser until the browser logs off the web server. Claim 8 is amended to recite that the network server authenticates the client browser, that the eCommerce services are provided to the client browser, and that the Lookup Server acts as a registry for tracking the eCommerce services and also provides dynamic updates to the client browser until it logs off the web server. Thus, independent claims 1 and 8 each particularly point out and distinctly claim the inventive subject matter.

Further, no essential steps are omitted in these claims as amended. Claim 1 recites that the user is authenticated by a web server in communication with the user's browser, that user access control information is communicated to the Lookup Server from the browser, and that the Lookup Server tracks the services available to the user based on the access control information. Claim 8 recites that the user is authenticated by a network server, that the availability of new or updated eCommerce services are made known by a Lookup Server, and that the Lookup Server receives user, group and service information which is stored in the database, and responds to this information by providing dynamic updates to the client browser.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1, and claims 9 and 11 depend from claim 8, each dependent claim incorporating all of the features and limitations of its base claim, so that the dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons that their base claims are patentable. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1-7 Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being
unpatentable over Tso, et al., U.S. Patent 6,892,226 (herein after "Tso") in view of
PointCast.com (hereinafter "PointCast"). This rejection should be withdrawn based on
the comments and remarks herein.

Tso discloses a dynamic advertising module programmed to control the display of
advertising content on a client device (column 3, lines 48-49), and that the advertising
content could be any dynamic content, that is, content that is not specifically requested by
the user (column 3, lines 5-7). In contrast to applicant's invention, Tso discloses that
dynamic content is automatically presented in response to a user's request for a data
object; the dynamic content is presented in addition to presenting this requested data
object (column 2, lines 30-33). Tso does not disclose or suggest group information, e.g.
information indicating the services the user is authorized to access, and does not disclose
or suggest a Lookup Server that acts as a registry for tracking one or more eCommerce
services, and that provides dynamic updates to a browser of new and/or updated
eCommerce services until the browser logs off the web server.

PointCast does not overcome this deficiency. PointCast does not disclose or
suggest notification of the availability of eCommerce services for performing commercial
transactions, but merely notifies a user of data, such as news, weather, or sports scores.
Further, PointCast does not disclose or suggest group information indicating services that
the user is authorized to access. Hence, the hypothetical combination of Tso and
PointCast does not disclose or suggest a "Lookup Server configured to act as a registry
for tracking at least one eCommerce service available to the user and, in response to said

-10-

group information, said Lookup Server configured to provide dynamic updates to the browser of new and/or updated eCommerce service, until said browser logs off said web server" as recited in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the art of record in the application. Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1, incorporating all of the features and limitations in the base claim. Thus these dependent claims are patenable over the art of record in the application at least for the reasons that the base claim is patentable over the art of record in the application. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 8, 9 and 11 Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected claims 8, 9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tso in view of PointCast in view of "IBM DCE V3.1 for AIX and IBM DCE V3.1 for Solaris" (hereinafter "IBM"). This rejection should be withdrawn based on the comments and remarks herein.

As discussed above, the hypothetical combination of Tso and PointCast does not disclose or suggest a Lookup Server that acts as a registry for tracking at least one eCommerce service available to the user, the Lookup Server providing dynamic updates to said client browser of new and/or updated eCommerce services until said client browser logs off said web server, in response to data provided by said network server to said client browser, said data based on stored user information of said client browser and the user, group and services information accessed in the database. IBM does not overcome this deficiency and the Examiner does not state otherwise.

In addition, the Examiner states that neither Tso nor PointCast disclose

computationally intensive jobs distributed for execution by the LoadBalancer/ComputeServer but that IBM teaches this feature. IBM states that one practical application of DCE V3.1 is load balancing but does not provide any further disclosure. Thus "computationally intensive jobs distributed for execution" as recited in claim 8 is not taught in either Tso, PointCast or IBM. Accordingly, claim 8 is patentably distinct from the art of record in the application. Claims 9 and 11 depend from claim 8, incorporating all of the features and limitations of the base claim. Hence, claims 9 and 11 are patentably distinct from the art of the record in the application for at least the reasons that claim 8 is patentably distinct from the art of record in the application.

Thus, applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

For at least the reasons set forth in the foregoing discussion, Applicant believes that the Application is now allowable and respectfully requests that the Examiner consider the claims as amended herein and allow the Application. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this Amendment, or regarding the Application generally, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Katherine R. Vieyra
Registration No. 47,155

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

KRV/jam

H\Work\1330\13361\amend\13361.amd5